

Under the provisions of Section 413.031 of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, Title 5, Subtitle A of the Texas Labor Code, effective June 17, 2001 and Commission Rule 133.305 titled Medical Dispute Resolution - General and 133.308 titled Medical Dispute Resolution by Independent Review Organizations, the Medical Review Division assigned an IRO to conduct a review of the disputed medical necessity issues between the requestor and the respondent. The dispute was received on March 24, 2003.

The Medical Review Division has reviewed the IRO decision and determined that **the requestor prevailed** on the issues of medical necessity for office visits, neuromuscular re-education, joint mobilization, therapeutic procedures, myofascial release, muscle testing, range of motion measurements, and electrical stimulation. Therefore, upon receipt of this Order and in accordance with §133.308(r)(9), the Commission hereby orders the respondent and non-prevailing party to **refund the requestor \$650** for the paid IRO fee. For the purposes of determining compliance with the order, the Commission will add 20 days to the date the order was deemed received as outlined on page one of this order.

In accordance with §413.031(e), it is a defense for the carrier if the carrier timely complies with the IRO decision.

Based on review of the disputed issues within the request, the Medical Review Division has determined that **medical necessity was the only issue** to be resolved. Office visits, neuromuscular re-education, joint mobilization, therapeutic procedures, myofascial release, muscle testing, range of motion measurements, and electrical stimulation were found to be medically necessary. The respondent raised no other reasons for denying reimbursement for the above listed services.

On this basis, and pursuant to §§402.042, 413.016, 413.031, and 413.019 of the Act, the Medical Review Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to pay the unpaid medical fees in accordance with the fair and reasonable rate as set forth in Commission Rule 133.1(a)(8) plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the requestor within 20 days of receipt of this order. This Order is applicable to dates of service 03-19-03 through 06-02-03 in this dispute.

The respondent is prohibited from asserting additional denial reasons relative to this Decision upon issuing payment to the requestor in accordance with this Order (Rule 133.307(j)(2)).

This Order is hereby issued this 26th day of April 2004.

Georgina Rodriguez
Medical Dispute Resolution Officer
Medical Review Division
GR/gr

On this basis, and pursuant to §§402.042, 413.016, 413.031, and 413.019 of the Act, the Medical Review Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to pay the unpaid medical fees in accordance with the fair and reasonable rate as set forth in Commission Rule 133.1(a)(8) plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the requestor within 20 days of receipt of this order. This Order is applicable to dates of service 03-19-03 through 06-2-03 in this dispute.

The respondent is prohibited from asserting additional denial reasons relative to this Decision upon issuing payment to the requestor in accordance with this Order (Rule 133.307(j)(2)).

This Order is hereby issued this 26th day of April 2004.

Roy Lewis, Supervisor
Medical Dispute Resolution
Medical Review Division
RL/gr

IRO Certificate #4599

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

March 15, 2004

Re: IRO Case # M5-04-0532-01

Texas Worker's Compensation Commission:

___ has been certified as an independent review organization (IRO) and has been authorized to perform independent reviews of medical necessity for the Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC). Texas HB. 2600, Rule 133.308 effective January 1, 2002, allows a claimant or provider who has received an adverse medical necessity determination from a carrier's internal process, to request an independent review by an IRO.

In accordance with the requirement that TWCC assign cases to certified IROs, TWCC assigned this case to ___ for an independent review. ___ has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine if the adverse determination was appropriate. For that purpose, ___ received relevant medical records, any documents obtained from parties in making the adverse determination, and any other documents and/or written information submitted in support of the appeal.

The case was reviewed by a physician who is Board Certified in Neurological Surgery, and who has met the requirements for TWCC Approved Doctor List or has been approved as an exception to the Approved Doctor List. He or she has signed a certification statement attesting that no known conflicts of interest exist between him or her and any of the treating physicians or

providers, or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed the case for a determination prior to referral to ____ for independent review. In addition, the certification statement further attests that the review was performed without bias for or against the carrier, medical provider, or any other party to this case.

The determination of the ____ reviewer who reviewed this case, based on the medical records provided, is as follows:

History

The patient is a 40-year-old male who was injured while lifting a bucket of paint. He developed back pain that extended into both lower extremities. Despite physical therapy, the pain continued and MRI evaluation indicated a probable left-sided L5-S1 disk rupture of surgical significance. On 11/20/02 a lumbar microdiscectomy on the left side was performed at L5-S1. The patient's post operative course has required continued physical therapy because of persistent pain.

Requested Service(s)

Ovs, neuromuscular reeducation, joint mobilization, therapeutic proc, myofascial release, 95831 Muscle testing, 95851 ROM measurements, 97014 electrical stimulation, 3/19/03-6/2/03

Decision

I disagree with the carrier's decision to deny the requested services.

Rationale

It is not unusual for a patient to have a prolonged course of physical therapy before work hardening or work conditioning is pursued. The patient was given an order for work hardening on 5/20/03, which is during the period of this dispute. A 3/17/03 FCE revealed that the patient was not ready to return to work. It appears that the delay in getting work hardening approved led to the rather prolonged physical therapy course. Physical therapy was indicated, rather than letting the patient potentially regress from the improvement that had occurred post operatively.

This medical necessity decision by an Independent Review Organization is deemed to be a Commission decision and order.